

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in view of the present Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0156900 to Marquette, et al. (“Marquette”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,103,644 to Zhang, et al. (“Zhang”). Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended for clarification. After careful review of the claims and references, it is believed that all the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

The independent claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to clarify that they are directed to Internet calls. The independent claims 1, 11, and 21, and claim 2-10, 12-20, and 22-28 which are dependent thereon, are now believed to be in allowable form.

Claims 1-28 have been rejected as obvious over Marquette in view of Zhang. Marquette describes a system which receives a converted PSTN telephone call 302 at a telephone board 306 (paragraph 0047, lines 1-5) which connects the call to a media server 308 of the call handling system using standard PSTN signaling (paragraph 0049, lines 1-3) which then converts the call to an IP standard such as SIP and sends an INVITE to a control module 310 (paragraph 0050, lines 1-3) which determines which of a set of applications corresponds to the called telephone number (paragraph 0051, lines 1-5). Thus, Marquette does not receive a SIP INVITE over the Internet from the client. Rather, it receives a PSTN call over the standard telephone system from the client and converts it. In addition, Marquette does not determine a call type from the INVITE, but rather determines an application program 312 (not a call type) to be used based on the telephone number called (not based on the call type). In addition, paragraph 0053 of Marquette

describes the SIP INVITE being sent to another application program if the initially selected one is not available. There is no disclosure of selecting an agent to handle the Internet call based on the call type, only selection of an application program based on the called telephone number.

Paragraph 0054-55 of Marquette describes creation of another SIP INVITE sent from the application program 312 to a service program 314 and connection of the service program to communicate with the caller. Thus, the call is set up between the service program 314 and the caller, not a selected agent and the caller not through a buffer server, not on the Internet, and there is no disclosures of requesting a notification from the agent upon termination of the Internet call. Thus, Marquette describes a system dramatically different from the claimed invention and does not disclose any of the claimed elements of the independent claims 1, 11, and 21.


The Office Action concedes that Marquette does not disclose a buffer server but that Zhang does at Col. 7, lines 3-32, Figs. 4 and 5. However, these passages merely describe servers that provide services to users but do not describe a buffer server providing for an Internet call to be set up through it. Thus, Zhang does not disclose the claimed buffer server. Therefore, the combination of Marquette and Zhang do not disclose the above features and independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are distinguishable over the combination. In addition, the dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-28 are believed to be allowable because they depend from allowable base claims 1, 11, and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the extension of time fee, RCE fee, petition fee, issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. A duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ

By:   
James A. Scheer  
Registration No. 29,434

Dated: November 11, 2008

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500